

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/048,040 | 01/24/2002 | Wolter Ten Hoeve | NL 010357 | 1130 Y |
| 7590 10/02/2003 | | | EXAMINER | |
| Corporate Patent Counsel | | | LIPMAN, BERNARD | |
| Philips Electronics North America Corporation 580 White Plains Road | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| Tarrytown, NY 10591 | | | 1713 | |

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| 3 | | | RI |
|---|--|--|-----|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | 1 |
| , | 10/048,040 | TEN HOEVE ET AL. | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Bernard Lipman | 1713 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | pears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | • | | |
| 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) Th | nis action is non-final. | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allows closed in accordance with the practice under | | | |
| Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application | , | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | WITHOIT CONSIDERATION. | | |
| 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | |
| 8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> are subject to restriction and/or | election requirement. | | |
| Application Papers | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine | er. | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ acce | pted or b)⊡ objected to by the Exa | miner. | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the | | | |
| 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on | | oved by the Examiner. | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in re | • | | |
| 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | caminer. | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign | n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a | i)-(d) or (t). | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority document | | M | |
| 2. Coring of the partition or in a of the prior | | | |
| 3.☑ Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Bu* See the attached detailed Office action for a list | reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | _ | |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest | ic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e | e) (to a provisional application | า). |
| a) The translation of the foreign language pro 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | 5) Notice of Informal F | r (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152) | |
| | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 04-01) Serial No. 10/048,040

Art Unit 1713

1. This application contains two distinct groups of invention which are represented by, Group I, claims 1-8 and Group II, claims 9-14, each group being directed to different structurally exclusive polymers and the method of making these polymers. Although the polymers of Group I are involved in the production of the polymers of Group II, the production and, therefore, the polymers of Group II contain special technical features separate and distinct from those identifiable for the claims of Group I. Restriction between these groups, therefore, is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

2. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Specific polymers and the methods of making polymers with the aromatic group of the structure specifically identified.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1 and 9 are generic.

Serial No. 10/048,040

Art Unit 1713

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of the other invention.

Serial No. 10/048,040

Art Unit 1713

Bernard Lipman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1713

BL:cdc September 29, 2003

•) •

#